

REMARKS

Claims 1-21 and 24 are now in the case. New claim 24 finds support, at least, on page 11, lines 36-38 of Applicant's specification.

Response to the Office Action

The Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 over Leonard '564 in view of Leonard '380 and Purzycki

Claims 1-21 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,178,564 to Leonard et al. (hereinafter "Leonard '564") in view of U.S. Patent 6,662,380 to Leonard et al. (hereinafter "Leonard '380") and further in view of U.S. Patent 4,666,671 to Purzycki et al. (hereinafter "Purzycki"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. The references do not establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness since they do not teach or suggest all of Applicants' claim limitations. Specifically, none of the cited references teach or suggest a lavatory bowl rim block having both 1) a liquid, perfume-containing composition with a dispenser and 2) a fragrance delivery component in which the fragrance is not dispensed using the liquid, perfume-containing composition dispensing means.

None of the cited references teach or suggest a separate fragrance delivery component. The Office Action states "People of ordinary skill in cleaning are well aware of using multiple fragrances. This is not considered beyond the knowledge of chemist or formulators." Applicants contend that the claimed invention is not solely directed towards combining more than one fragrance in a cleaning composition. Applicants' claimed invention addresses the ongoing need for prolonged fragrance delivery to the bathroom atmosphere in addition to a bowl cleaning composition. The prior art references cited in the Office Action all use perfumes as part of the cleaning composition.

Furthermore, there is no motivation provided for one skilled in the art to devise a separate fragrance delivery component. The references use perfumes as part

of the cleaning composition(s) to provide a fragrance benefit. There is no indication in the references that this is ineffective. Therefore, there is no motivation to prepare a separate area dedicated to releasing a fragrance.

Applicants contend that one skilled in the art would not be motivated to prepare a device specifically dedicated to fragrance delivery. See, for example, Claim 12 and new Claim 24. Applicants contend that the cited prior art references provide no motivation to include an electrical fragrance release system or use a filmed recess that does not permit water to escape.

Applicants' claimed invention relates to a novel method of providing the dual benefit of lavatory bowl cleaning and a separate fragrance source that provides a prolonged scent benefit. The references cited in the Office Action all relate to providing scent via the bowl cleaning composition (liquid or solid). Applicants' claimed invention clearly requires the presence of a fragrance delivery component that does not use the dispenser for the liquid bowl cleaner. Applicants respectfully submit that this separate fragrance element is not taught or suggested by any of the cited references. Therefore, Applicants contend that the combination of Leonard '564 in view of Leonard '380 and Purzycki does not establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness since they don't disclose an element of Applicants' claimed invention (see MPEP 2143.03). As a result, Applicants contend that their claimed invention is novel and unobvious and that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that Claims 1-21 and 24 are in condition for allowance. Early and favorable action on all claims is therefore requested.

If the next action is other than to allow the claims, the favor of a telephonic interview is requested with the undersigned representative.

Respectfully submitted,

THE PROCTER & GAMBLE COMPANY



Brent M. Peebles
Registration No. 38,576
(513) 983-0400

Dated: September 23, 2008
Customer No. 27752